

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



ifu

PTO/SB/21 (0503)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	10/732,764
Filing Date	December 10, 2003
First Named Inventor	Gisle Dankel, et al.
Group Art Unit	2122
Examiner Name	

Total Number of Pages in This Submission	167	Attorney Docket Number	45256.00050UTL
--	-----	------------------------	----------------

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks Submitting certified copies of priority documents as listed: Country: United Kingdom Country: United Kingdom Country: United Kingdom Number: 03 09056.0 Number: 03 15164.4 Number: 03 20716.4 Date: 22 April 2003 Date: 30 June 2003 Date: 04 September 2003		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Bradley D. Blanche, Registration No. 38,387
Signature	
Date	May 18, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	Judy A. Smith		
Signature		Date	May 18, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and selection option 2





INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales
NP10 8QQ

I, the undersigned, being an officer duly authorised in accordance with Section 74(1) and (4) of the Deregulation & Contracting Out Act 1994, to sign and issue certificates on behalf of the Comptroller-General, hereby certify that annexed hereto is a true copy of the documents as originally filed in connection with the patent application identified therein.

In accordance with the Patents (Companies Re-registration) Rules 1982, if a company named in this certificate and any accompanying documents has re-registered under the Companies Act 1980 with the same name as that with which it was registered immediately before re-registration save for the substitution as, or inclusion as, the last part of the name of the words "public limited company" or their equivalents in Welsh, references to the name of the company in this certificate and any accompanying documents shall be treated as references to the name with which it is so re-registered.

In accordance with the rules, the words "public limited company" may be replaced by p.l.c., plc, P.L.C. or PLC.

Re-registration under the Companies Act does not constitute a new legal entity but merely subjects the company to certain additional company law rules.

Signed

Dated

18 March 2004



the 1990s, the number of people in the world who are undernourished has declined by 100 million. The number of people who are malnourished has declined by 150 million. The number of people who are obese has increased by 100 million. The number of people who are overweight has increased by 150 million. The number of people who are undernourished has declined by 100 million. The number of people who are malnourished has declined by 150 million. The number of people who are obese has increased by 100 million. The number of people who are overweight has increased by 150 million.

Patents Form 1/77 22 APR 2003

The Patent Office
Cardiff Road
Newport
NP9 1RH

Request for grant of a patent 22 APR 2003

THE PATENT OFFICE

NEWPORT

1. Your Reference	IMR/CEE/Y808	22APR03 E801531-1 002846 P01/7700 0.00-0309056.0	
2. Application number	0309056.0		
3. Full name, address and postcode of the or each Applicant	Transitive Technologies Limited Suite 2B The Triangle Hanging Ditch Manchester M4 3TR		
Country/state of incorporation (if applicable)	Incorporated in: United Kingdom		
4. Title of the invention	Block Translation Optimizations for Program Code Conversion		
5. Name of agent	APPLEYARD LEES		
Address for service in the UK to which all correspondence should be sent	15 CLARE ROAD HALIFAX HX1 2HY		
Patents ADP number	190001 ✓		
6. Priority claimed to:	Country	Application number	Date of filing
7. Divisional status claimed from:	Number of parent application		Date of filing
8. Is a statement of inventorship and of right to grant a patent required in support of this application?	YES		

9. Enter the number of sheets for any of the following items you are filing with this form. Do not count copies of the same document

Continuation sheets of this form	-
Description	59
Claim(s)	6
Abstract	1
Drawing(s)	8

10. If you are also filing any of the following, state how many against each item


Priority documents	-
Translation of priority documents	-
Statement of inventorship and right to grant a patent (PF 7/77)	-
Request for a preliminary examination and search (PF 9/77)	-
Request for substantive examination (PF 10/77)	-
Any other documents (please specify)	-

11.

We request the grant of a patent on the basis of this application.
Signature Date

APPLEYARD LEES

17 April 2003



12. Contact

Ian Robinson- 01422 330110


**BLOCK TRANSLATION OPTIMIZATIONS FOR
PROGRAM CODE CONVERSION**

The subject invention relates generally to the field
5 of computers and computer software and, more particularly,
to program code conversion methods and apparatus useful,
for example, in code translators, emulators and
accelerators.

10 In both embedded and non-embedded CPU's, one finds
predominant Instruction Set Architectures (ISAs) for which
large bodies of software exist that could be "accelerated"
for performance, or "translated" to a myriad of capable
processors that could present better cost/performance
15 benefits, provided that they could transparently access
the relevant software. One also finds dominant CPU
architectures that are locked in time to their ISA, and
cannot evolve in performance or market reach. Such
architectures would benefit from "Synthetic CPU" co-
20 architecture.

Program code conversion methods and apparatus
facilitate such acceleration, translation and co-
architecture capabilities and are addressed, for example,
25 in WO 99/03168 entitled Program Code Conversion.

According to the present invention there is provided
an apparatus and method as set forth in the appended
claims. Preferred features of the invention will be
30 apparent from the dependent claims, and the description
which follows.



The following is a summary of various aspects and advantages realizable according to various embodiments according to the invention. It is provided as an introduction to assist those skilled in the art to more rapidly assimilate the detailed design discussion that ensues and does not and is not intended in any way to limit the scope of the claims that are appended hereto.

In particular, the inventors have developed a number of optimization techniques directed at expediting program code conversion, particularly useful in connection with a run-time translator which employs translation of successive basic blocks of subject program code into target code wherein the target code corresponding to a first basic block is executed prior to generation of target code for the next basic block.

In one such optimization referred to as "extended basic blocks," the translator detects whether the starting address of a successor basic block is statically determinable, and, if so, performs target code generation for both the initial basic block and its successor together before execution of the target code.

In another process referred to as "group blocking", the translator applies a selection algorithm to identify a group of previously translated basic blocks for retranslation as a contiguous whole. Such an algorithm may compare a profiling metric stored in a basic block data structure with a profiling threshold, for example, to determine when to initiate group block creation and to determine which basic blocks to include in a group block. In its simplest case, the profiling metric may be

execution count, i.e., the number of times a particular basic block has been executed. The blocks selected for the group are preferably ordered and subjected to further optimizations, including global dead code elimination and
5 global register allocation, prior to target code generation.

A particularly advantageous embodiment provides a cached basic block data structure which facilitates
10 implementation of extended basic blocks and group blocking, together with isoblocking and cached translation state.

For a better understanding of the invention, and to
15 show how embodiments of the same may be carried into effect, reference will now be made, by way of example, to the accompanying diagrammatic drawings in which:

Figure 1 is a block diagram of apparatus wherein
20 embodiments of the invention find application;

Figure 2 is a schematic diagram illustrating a run-time translation process and corresponding IR (intermediate representation) generated during the
25 process;

Figure 3 is a schematic illustrating a basic block data structure and cache according to an illustrative embodiment of the invention;

30

Figure 4 is a flow diagram illustrating an extended basic block process;

Figure 5 is a flow diagram illustrating isoblocking;

Figure 6 is a flow diagram illustrating group blocking and attendant optimizations; and

5

Figure 7 is a schematic diagram of an example illustrating group block optimization.

Figure 8 is a flow diagram illustrating run-time
10 translation, including extended basic blocking, isoblocking, and group blocking.

Illustrative apparatus for implementing various novel features discussed below is shown in Figure 1. Figure 1
15 illustrates a target processor 13 including target registers 15 together with memory 18 storing a number of software components 19, 20, 21, and providing working storage 16 including a basic block cache 23, a global register store 27, and the subject code 17 to be
20 translated. The software components include an operating system 20, the translator code 19, and translated code 21. The translator code 19 may function, for example, as an emulator translating subject code of one ISA into translated code of another ISA or as an accelerator for
25 translating subject code into translated code, each of the same ISA.

The translator 19, i.e., the compiled version of the source code implementing the translator, and the
30 translated code 21, i.e., the translation of the subject code 17 produced by the translator 19, run in conjunction with the operating system 20 such as, for example, UNIX running on the target processor 13, typically a

microprocessor or other suitable computer. It will be appreciated that the structure illustrated in Figure 1 is exemplary only and that, for example, software, methods and processes according to the invention may be implemented in code residing within or beneath an operating system. The subject code, translator code, operating system, and storage mechanisms may be any of a wide variety of types, as known to those skilled in the art.

10

In apparatus according to Figure 1, program code conversion is preferably performed dynamically, at run-time, while the translated code 21 is running. The translator 19 runs inline with the translated program 21. The execution path of the translation process is a control loop comprising the steps of: executing translator code 19, which translates a block of the subject code 17 into translated code 21, and then executing that block of translated code; the end of each block of translated code contains instructions to return control back to the translator code 19. In other words, the steps of translating and then executing the subject code are interlaced, such that only portions of the subject program 17 are translated at a time and the translated code of a first basic block is executed prior to the translation of subsequent basic blocks. The translator's fundamental unit of translation is the basic block, meaning that the translator 19 translates the subject code 17 one basic block at a time. A basic block is formally defined as a section of code with exactly one entry point and exactly one exit point, which limits the block code to a single control path. For this reason, basic blocks are the fundamental unit of control flow.

30

In the process of generating the translated code 21, intermediate representation ("IR") trees are generated based on the subject instruction sequence. IR trees are
5 abstract representations of the expressions calculated and operations performed by the subject program. Later, translated code 21 is generated based on the IR trees.

The collections of IR nodes described herein are
10 colloquially referred to as "trees". We note that, formally, such structures are in fact directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), not trees. The formal definition of a tree requires that each node have at most one parent. Because the embodiments described use common subexpression
15 elimination during IR generation, nodes will often have multiple parents. For example, the IR of a flag-affecting instruction result may be referred to by two abstract registers, those corresponding to the destination subject register and the flag result parameter.

20

For example, the subject instruction "add %r1, %r2, %r3" performs the addition of the contents of subject registers %r2 and %r3 and stores the result in subject register %r1. Thus, this instruction corresponds to the
25 abstract expression "%r1 = %r2 + %r3". This example contains a definition of the abstract register %r1 with an add expression containing two subexpressions representing the instruction operands %r2 and %r3. In the context of a subject program 17, these subexpressions may correspond to
30 other, prior subject instructions, or they may represent details of the current instruction such as immediate constant values.

When the "add" instruction is parsed, a new "+" IR node is generated, corresponding to the abstract mathematical operator for addition. The "+" IR node stores references to other IR nodes that represent the
 5 operands (represented in the IR as subexpression trees, often held in subject registers). The "+" node is itself referenced by the subject register whose value it defines (the abstract register for %r1, the instruction's destination register). For example, the center-right
 10 portion of Figure 20 shows the IR tree corresponding to the X86 instruction "add %ecx, %edx".

As those skilled in the art may appreciate, in one embodiment the translator 19 is implemented using an
 15 object-oriented programming language such as C++. For example, an IR node is implemented as a C++ object, and references to other nodes are implemented as C++ references to the C++ objects corresponding to those other nodes. An IR tree is therefore implemented as a
 20 collection of IR node objects, containing various references to each other.

Further, in the embodiment under discussion, IR generation uses a set of abstract registers. These
 25 abstract registers correspond to specific features of the subject architecture. For example, there is a unique abstract register for each physical register on the subject architecture ("subject register"). Similarly, there is a unique abstract register for each condition
 30 code flag present on the subject architecture. Abstract registers serve as placeholders for IR trees during IR generation. For example, the value of subject register %r2 at a given point in the subject instruction sequence

is represented by a particular IR expression tree, which is associated with the abstract register for subject register %r2. In one embodiment, an abstract register is implemented as a C++ object, which is associated with a particular IR tree via a C++ reference to the root node object of that tree.

In the example instruction sequence described above, the translator has already generated IR trees corresponding to the values of %r2 and %r3 while parsing the subject instructions that precede the "add" instruction. In other words, the subexpressions that calculate the values of %r2 and %r3 are already represented as IR trees. When generating the IR tree for the "add %r1, %r2, %r3" instruction, the new "+" node contains references to the IR subtrees for %r2 and %r3. The implementation of the abstract registers is divided between components in both the translator code 19 and the translated code 21. Within the translator 19, an "abstract register" is a placeholder used in the course of IR generation, such that the abstract register is associated with the IR tree that calculates the value of the subject register to which the particular abstract register corresponds. As such, abstract registers in the translator may be implemented as a C++ object which contains a reference to an IR node object (i.e., an IR tree). The aggregate of all IR trees referred to by the abstract register set is referred to as the working IR forest ("forest" because it contains multiple abstract register roots, each of which refers to an IR tree). The working IR forest represents a snapshot of the abstract operations of the subject program at a particular point in the subject code.

Within the translated code 21, an "abstract register" is a specific location within the global register store, to and from which subject register values are synchronized with the actual target registers. Alternatively, when a value has been loaded from the global register store, an abstract register in the translated code 21 could be understood to be a target register 15, which temporarily holds a subject register value during the execution of the translated code 21, prior to being saved back to the register store.

An example of program translation as described above is illustrated in Figure 2. Figure 2 shows the translation of two basic blocks of x86 instructions, and the corresponding IR trees that are generated in the process of translation. The left side of Figure 2 shows the execution path of the translator 19 during translation. In step 151, the translator 19 translates a first basic block 153 of subject code into target code 21 and then, in step 155, executes that target code 21. When the target code 21 finishes execution, control is returned to the translator 19, step 157, wherein the translator translates the next basic block 159 of subject code 17 into target code 21 and then executes that target code 21, step 161, and so on.

In the course of translating the first basic block 153 of subject code into target code, the translator 19 generates an IR tree 163 based on that basic block 153. In this case, the IR tree 163 is generated from the source instruction "add %ecx, %edx," which is a flag-affecting instruction. In the course of generating the IR tree 163,

four abstract registers are defined by this instruction: the destination abstract register %ecx 167, the first flag-affecting instruction parameter 169, the second flag-affecting instruction parameter 171, and the flag-affecting instruction result 173. The IR tree corresponding to the "add" instruction is a "+" operator 175 (i.e., arithmetic addition), whose operands are the subject registers %ecx 177 and %edx 179.

Thus, emulation of the first basic block 153 puts the flags in a pending state by storing the parameters and result of the flag-affecting instruction. The flag-affecting instruction is "add %ecx, %edx." The parameters of the instruction are the current values of emulated subject registers %ecx 177 and %edx 179. The "@" symbol preceding the subject register uses 177, 179 indicate that the values of the subject registers are retrieved from the global register store, from the locations corresponding to %ecx and %edx, respectively, as these particular subject registers were not previously loaded by the current basic block. These parameter values are then stored in the first and second flag parameter abstract registers 169, 171. The result of the addition operation 175 is stored in the flag result abstract register 173.

25

After the IR tree is generated, the corresponding target code 21 is generated based on the IR. The process of generating target code 21 from a generic IR is well understood in the art. Target code is inserted at the end of the translated block to save the abstract registers, including those for the flag result 173 and the flag parameters 169, 171, to the global register store 27.

30

After the target code is generated, it is then executed, step 155.

Figure 2 shows an example of translation and execution interlaced. The translator 19 first generates translated code 21 based on the subject instructions 17 of a first basic block 153, then the translated code for basic block 153 is executed. At the end of the first basic block 153, the translated code 21 returns control to the translator 19, which then translates a second basic block 159. The translated code 21 for the second basic block 161 is then executed. At the end of the execution of the second basic block 159, the translated code returns control to the translator 19, which then translates the next basic block, and so forth.

Thus, a subject program running under the translator 19 has two different types of code that execute in an interleaved manner: the translator code 19 and the translated code 21. The translator code 19 is generated by a compiler, prior to run-time, based on the high-level source code implementation of the translator 19. The translated code 21 is generated by the translator code 19, throughout run-time, based on the subject code 17 of the program being translated.

The representation of the subject processor state is likewise divided between the translator 19 and translated code 21 components. The translator 19 stores subject processor state in a variety of explicit programming language devices such as variables and/or objects; the compiler used to compile the translator determines how the state and operations are implemented in target code. The

translated code 21, by comparison, stores subject processor state implicitly in target registers and memory locations, which are manipulated directly by the target instructions of the translated code 21.

5

For example, the low-level representation of the global register store 27 is simply a region of allocated memory. This is how the translated code 21 sees and interacts with the abstract registers, by saving and
10 restoring between the defined memory region and various target registers. In the source code of the translator 19, however, the global register store 27 is a data array or an object which can be accessed and manipulated at a higher level. With respect to the translated code 21,
15 there simply is no high-level representation.

In some cases, subject processor state which is static or statically determinable in the translator 19 is encoded directly into the translated code 21 rather than being
20 calculated dynamically. For example, the translator 19 may generate translated code 21 that is specialized on the instruction type of the last flag-affecting instruction, meaning that the translator would generate different target code for the same basic block if the instruction
25 type of the last flag-affecting instruction changed.

The translator 19 contains data structures corresponding to each basic block translation, which particularly facilitates extended basic block, isoblock,
30 group block, and cached translation state optimizations as hereafter described. Figure 3 illustrates such a basic block data structure 30, which includes a subject address 31, a target code pointer 33 (i.e., the target address of

the translated code), translation hints 34, entry and exit conditions 35, a profiling metric 37, references to the data structures of the predecessor and successor basic blocks 38, 39, and an entry register map 40. Figure 3
5 further illustrates the basic block cache 23, which is a collection of basic block data structures, e.g., 30, 41, 42, 43, 44 . . . indexed by subject address. In one embodiment, the data corresponding to a particular translated basic block may be stored in a C++ object. The
10 translator creates a new basic block object as the basic block is translated.

The subject address 31 of the basic block is the starting address of that basic block in the memory space
15 of the subject program 17, meaning the memory location where the basic block would be located if the subject program 17 were running on the subject architecture. This is also referred to as the subject starting address. While each basic block corresponds to a range of subject
20 addresses (one for each subject instruction), the subject starting address is the subject address of the first instruction in the basic block.

The target address 33 of the basic block is the memory location (starting address) of the translated code 21 in
25 the target program. The target address 33 is also referred to as the target code pointer, or the target starting address. To execute a translated block, the translator 19 treats the target address as a function pointer which is dereferenced to invoke (transfer control
30 to) the translated code.

The basic block data structures 30, 41, 42, 43, . . . are stored in the basic block cache 23, which is a

repository of basic block objects organized by subject address. When the translated code of a basic block finishes executing, it returns control to the translator 19 and also returns the value of the basic block's destination (successor) subject address 31 to the translator. To determine if the successor basic block has already been translated, the translator 19 compares the destination subject address 31 against the subject addresses 31 of basic blocks in the basic block cache 23 (i.e., those that have already been translated). Basic blocks which have not been yet translated are translated and then executed. Basic blocks which have already been translated (and which have compatible entry conditions, as discussed below) are simply executed. Over time, many of the basic blocks encountered will already have been translated, which causes the incremental translation cost to decrease. As such, the translator 19 gets faster over time, as fewer and fewer blocks require translation.

20 **Extended Basic Blocks**

One optimization applied according to the illustrative embodiment is to increase the scope of code generation by a technique referred to as "extended basic blocks." In cases where a basic block A has only one successor block (e.g., basic block B), the translator may be able to statically determine (when A is decoded) the subject address of B. In such cases, basic blocks A and B are combined into a single block (A') which is referred to as an extended basic block. Put differently, the extended basic block mechanism can be applied to unconditional jumps whose destination is statically determinable; if a jump is conditional or if the destination cannot be

statically determined, then a separate basic block must be formed. An extended basic block may still formally be a basic block, because after the intervening jump from A to B is removed, the code of block A' has only a single flow
 5 of control, and therefore no synchronization is necessary at the AB boundary.

Even if A has multiple possible successors including B, extended basic blocks may be used to extend A into B
 10 for a particular execution in which B is the actual successor and B's address is statically determinable.

Statically determinable addresses are those the translator can determine at decode-time. During
 15 construction of a block's IR forest, an IR tree is constructed for the destination subject address, which is associated with the destination address abstract register. If the value of destination address IR tree is statically determinable (i.e., does not depend on dynamic or run-time
 20 subject register values), then the successor block is statically determinable. For example, in the case of an unconditional jump instruction, the destination address (i.e., the subject starting address of the successor block) is implicit in the jump instruction itself; the
 25 subject address of the jump instruction plus the offset encoded in the jump instruction equals the destination address. Likewise, the optimizations of constant folding (e.g., $X + (2 + 3) \Rightarrow X + 5$) and expression folding (e.g., $(X * 5) * 10 \Rightarrow X * 50$) may cause an otherwise "dynamic"
 30 destination address to become statically determinable. The calculation of the destination address thus consists of extracting the constant value from the destination address IR.

When extended basic block A' is created, the translator subsequently treats it the same as any other basic block when performing IR generation, optimizations, and code generation. Because the code generation algorithms are operating on a larger scope (i.e., the code of basic blocks A and B combined), the translator generates more optimal code.

As one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, decoding is the process of extracting individual subject instructions from the subject code. The subject code is stored as an unformatted byte stream (i.e., a collection of bytes in memory). In the case of subject architectures with variable-length instructions (e.g., X86), decoding first requires the identification of instruction boundaries; in the case of fixed-length instruction architectures, identifying instruction boundaries is trivial (e.g., on the MIPS, every four bytes is an instruction). The subject instruction format is then applied to the bytes that constitute a given instruction to extract the instruction data (i.e., the instruction type, operand register numbers, immediate field values, and any other information encoded in the instruction). The process of decoding machine instructions of a known architecture from an unformatted byte stream using that architecture's instruction format is well understood in the art.

Figure 4 illustrates the creation of an extended basic block. A set of constituent basic blocks which is eligible to become an extended basic block is detected when the earliest eligible basic block (A) is decoded. If

the translator 19 detects that A's successor (B) is statically determinable 51, it calculates B's starting address 53 and then resumes the decoding process at the starting address of B. If B's successor (C) is determined
5 to be statically determinable 55, the decoding process proceeds to the starting address of C, and so forth. Of course, if a successor block is not statically determinable then normal translation and execution resume 61, 63, 65.

10

During all basic block decoding, the working IR forest includes an IR tree to calculate the subject address 31 of the current block's successor (i.e., the destination subject address; the translator has a dedicated abstract
15 register for the destination address). In the case of an extended basic block, to compensate for the fact that intervening jumps are being eliminated, as each new constituent basic block is assimilated by the decoding process, the IR tree for the calculation of that block's
20 subject address is pruned 54 (Figure 4). In other words, when the translator 19 statically calculates B's address and decoding resumes at B's starting address, the IR tree corresponding to the dynamic calculation of B's subject address 31 (which was constructed in the course of
25 decoding A) is pruned; when decoding proceeds to the starting address of C, the IR tree corresponding to C's subject address is pruned 59; and so forth. "Pruning" an IR tree means to remove any IR nodes which are depended on by the destination address abstract register and by no
30 other abstract registers. Put differently, pruning breaks the link between the IR tree and the destination abstract register; any other links to the same IR tree remain unaffected. In some cases, a pruned IR tree may also be

depended on by another abstract register, in which case the IR tree remains to preserve the subject program's execution semantics.

5 To prevent code explosion (traditionally, the mitigating factor against such code specialization techniques), the translator limits extended basic blocks to some maximum number of subject instructions. In one embodiment, extended basic blocks are limited to a maximum
10 of 200 subject instructions.

Isoblocks

Another optimization implemented in the illustrated
15 embodiment is so-called "isoblocking." According to this technique, translations of basic blocks are parameterized, or specialized, on a compatibility list, which is a set of variable conditions that describe the subject processor state and the translator state. The compatibility list is
20 different for each subject architecture, to take into account different architectural features. The actual values of the compatibility conditions at the entry and exit of a particular basic block translation are referred to as entry conditions and exit conditions, respectively.
25 If execution reaches a basic block which has already been translated but the previous translation's entry conditions differ from the current working conditions (i.e., the exit conditions of the previous block), then the basic block must be translated again, this time based on the current
30 working conditions. The result is that the same subject code basic block is now represented by multiple target code translations. These different translations of the same basic block are referred to as isoblocks.

To support isoblocks, the data associated with each basic block translation includes one set of entry conditions 35 and one set of exit conditions 36 (Figure 3). In one embodiment, the basic block cache 23 is organized first by subject address 31 and then by entry conditions 35, 36 (Figure 3). In another embodiment, when the translator queries the basic block cache 23 for a subject address 31, the query may return multiple translated basic blocks (isoblocks).

Figure 5 illustrates the use of isoblocks. At the end of a first translated block's execution, the translated code 21 calculates and returns the subject address of the next block (i.e., the successor) 71. Control is then returned to the translator 19, as demarcated by dashed line 73. In the translator 19, the basic block cache 23 is queried using the returned subject address 31, step 75. The basic block cache may return zero, one, or more than one basic block data structures with the same subject address 31. If the basic block cache 23 returns zero data structures (meaning that this basic block has not yet been translated), then the basic block must be translated, step 77, by the translator 19. Each data structure returned by the basic block cache 23 corresponds to a different translation (isoblock) of the same basic block of subject code. As illustrated at decision diamond 79, if the current exit conditions (of the first translated block) do not match the entry conditions of any of the data structures returned by the basic block cache 23, then the basic block must be translated again, step 81, this time parameterized on those exit conditions. If the current exit conditions match the entry conditions of one of the

data structures returned by the basic block cache 23, then that translation is compatible and can be executed without re-translation, step 83. In the illustrative embodiment, the translator 19 executes the compatible translated block
5 by dereferencing the target address as a function pointer. As noted above, basic block translations are preferably parameterized on a compatibility list. Exemplary compatibility lists will now be described for both the X86 and PowerPC architectures.

10

An illustrative compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes representations of: (1) lazy propagation of subject registers; (2) overlapping abstract registers; (3) type of pending condition code flag-
15 affecting instruction; (4) lazy propagation of condition code flag-affecting instruction parameters; (5) direction of string copy operations; (6) floating point unit (FPU) mode of the subject processor; and (7) modifications of the segment registers.

20

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes representations of any lazy propagation of subject registers by the translator, also referred to as register aliasing. Register aliasing occurs when the
25 translator knows that two subject registers contain the same value at a basic block boundary. As long as the subject register values remain the same, only one of the corresponding abstract registers is synchronized, by saving it to the global register store. Until the saved
30 subject register is overwritten, references to the non-saved register simply use or copy (via a move instruction) the saved register. This avoids two memory accesses (save + restore) in the translated code.

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes representations of which of the overlapping abstract registers are currently defined. In some cases, the subject architecture contains multiple overlapping subject registers which the translator represents using multiple overlapping abstract registers. For example, variable-width subject registers are represented using multiple overlapping abstract registers, one for each access size. For example, the X86 "EAX" register can be accessed using any of the following subject registers, each of which has a corresponding abstract register: EAX (bits 31...0), AX (bits 15...0), AH (bits 15...8), and AL (bits 7...0).

15

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes representations of, for each integer and floating point condition code flag, whether the flag value is normalized or pending, and if pending the type of the pending flag-affecting instruction.

20

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes representations of register aliasing for condition code flag-affecting instruction parameters (if some subject register still holds the value of a flag-affecting instruction parameter, or if the value of the second parameter is the same as the first). The compatibility list also includes representations of whether the second parameter is a small constant (i.e., an immediate instruction candidate), and if so its value.

30

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes a representation of the current direction of

string copy operations in the subject program. This condition field indicates whether string copy operations move upward or downward in memory. This supports code specialization of "strcpy()" function calls, by
5 parameterizing translations on the function's direction argument.

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture includes a representation of the FPU mode of the subject
10 processor. The FPU mode indicates whether subject floating-point instructions are operating in 32- or 64-bit mode.

The compatibility list for the X86 architecture
15 includes a representation of modifications of the segment registers. All X86 instruction memory references are based on one of six memory segment registers: CS (code segment), DS (data segment), SS (stack segment), ES (extra data segment), FS (general purpose segment), and GS
20 (general purpose segment). Under normal circumstances an application will not modify the segment registers. As such, code generation is by default specialized on the assumption that the segment register values remain constant. It is possible, however, for a program to
25 modify its segment registers, in which case the corresponding segment register compatibility bit will be set, causing the translator to generate code for generalized memory accesses using the appropriate segment register's dynamic value.

30

An illustrative embodiment of a compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes representations of: (1) mangled registers; (2) link value propagation; (3) type of

pending condition code flag-affecting instruction; (4) lazy propagation of condition code flag-affecting instruction parameters; (5) condition code flag value aliasing; and (6) summary overflow flag synchronization
5 state.

The compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes a representation of mangled registers. In cases where the subject code contains multiple consecutive
10 memory accesses using a subject register for the base address, the translator may translate those memory accesses using a mangled target register. In cases where subject program data is not located at the same address in target memory as it would have been in subject memory, the
15 translator must include a target offset in every memory address calculated by the subject code. While the subject register contains the subject base address, a mangled target register contains the target address corresponding to that subject base address (i.e., subject base address +
20 target offset). With register mangling, memory accesses can be translated more efficiently by applying the subject code offsets directly to the target base address, stored in the mangled register. By comparison, without the mangled register mechanism this scenario would require
25 additional manipulation of the target code for each memory access, at the cost of both space and execution time. The compatibility list indicates which abstract registers if any are mangled.

30 The compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes a representation of link value propagation. For leaf functions (i.e., functions that call no other functions), the function body may be extended (as with the

extended basic block mechanism discussed above) into the call/return site. Hence, the function body and the code that follows the function's return are translated together. This is also referred to as function return specialization, because such a translation includes code from, and is therefore specialized on, the function's return site. Whether a particular block translation used link value propagation is reflected in the exit conditions. As such, when the translator encounters a block whose translation used link value propagation, it must evaluate whether the current return site will be the same as the previous return site. Functions return to the same location from which they are called, so the call site and return site are effectively the same (offset by one or two instructions). The translator can therefore determine whether the return sites are the same by comparing the respective call sites; this is equivalent to comparing the subject addresses of the respective predecessor blocks (of the function block's prior and current executions). As such, in embodiments that support link value propagation, the data associated with each basic block translation includes a reference to the predecessor block translation (or some other representation of the predecessor block's subject address).

25

The compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes representations of, for each integer and floating point condition code flag, whether the flag value is normalized or pending, and if pending the type of the pending flag-affecting instruction.

30

The compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes representations of register aliasing for flag-affecting instruction parameters (if flag-affecting

instruction parameter values happen to be live in a subject register, or if the value of the second parameter is the same as the first). The compatibility list also includes representations of whether the second parameter is a small constant (i.e., an immediate instruction candidate), and if so its value.

The compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes representations of register aliasing for the PowerPC condition code flag values. The PowerPC architecture includes instructions for explicitly loading the entire set of PowerPC flags into a general purpose (subject) register. This explicit representation of the subject flag values in subject registers interferes with the translator's condition code flag emulation optimizations. The compatibility list contains a representation of whether the flag values are live in a subject register, and if so which register. During IR generation, references to such a subject register while it holds the flag values are translated into references to the corresponding abstract registers. This mechanism eliminates the need to explicitly calculate and store the subject flag values in a target register, which in turn allows the translator to apply the standard condition code flag optimizations.

The compatibility list for the PowerPC architecture includes a representation of summary overflow synchronization. This field indicates which of the eight summary overflow condition bits are current with the global summary overflow bit. When one of the PowerPC's eight condition fields is updated, if the global summary

overflow is set, it is copied to the corresponding summary overflow bit in the particular condition code field.

Translation Hints

5

Another optimization implemented in the illustrative embodiment employs the translation hints 34 of the basic block data structure of Figure 3. This optimization proceeds from a recognition that there is static basic
10 block data which is specific to a particular basic block, but which is the same for every translation of that block. For some types of static data which are expensive to calculate, it is more efficient for the translator to calculate the data once, during the first translation of
15 the corresponding block, and then store the result for future translations of the same block. Because this data is the same for every translation of the same block, it does not parameterize translation and therefore it is not formally part of the block's compatibility list (discussed
20 above). Expensive static data is still stored in the data associated with each basic block translation, however, as it is cheaper to save the data than it is to recalculate. In later translations of the same block, even if the translator 19 cannot reuse a prior translation, the
25 translator 19 can take advantage of these "translation hints" (i.e., the cached static data) to reduce the translation cost of the second and later translations.

In one embodiment, the data associated with each basic
30 block translation includes translation hints, which are calculated once during the first translation of that block and then copied (or referred to) on each subsequent translation.

For example, in a translator 19 implemented in C++, translation hints may be implemented as a C++ object, in which case the basic block objects which correspond to
 5 different translations of the same block would each store a reference to the same translation hints object. Alternatively, in a translator implemented in C++, the basic block cache 23 may contain one basic block object per subject basic block (rather than per translation),
 10 with each such object containing or holding a reference to the corresponding translation hints; such basic block objects also contain multiple references to translation objects that correspond to different translations of that block, organized by entry conditions.

15

Exemplary translation hints for the X86 architecture include representations of: (1) initial instruction prefixes; and (2) initial repeat prefixes. Such translation hints for the X86 architecture particularly
 20 include a representation of how many prefixes the first instruction in the block has. Some X86 instructions have prefixes which modify the operation of the instruction. This architectural feature makes it difficult (i.e., expensive) to decode an X86 instruction stream. Once the
 25 number of initial prefixes is determined during the first decoding of the block, that value is then stored by the translator 19 as a translation hint, so that subsequent translations of the same block do not need to determine it anew.

30

The translation hints for the X86 architecture further include a representation of whether the first instruction in the block has a repeat prefix. Some X86 instructions

such as string operations have a repeat prefix which tells the processor to execute that instruction multiple times. The translation hints indicate whether such a prefix is present, and if so its value.

5

In one embodiment, the translation hints associated with each basic block additionally include the entire IR forest corresponding to that basic block. This effectively caches all of the decoding and IR generation performed by the frontend. In another embodiment, the translation hints include the IR forest as it exists prior to being optimized. In another embodiment, the IR forest is not cached as a translation hint, in order to conserve the memory resources of the translated program.

15

Group Blocks

Another optimization implemented in the illustrative translator embodiment is directed to eliminating program overhead resulting from the necessity to synchronize all abstract registers at the end of execution of each translated basic block. This optimization is referred to as group block optimization.

As discussed above, in basic block mode (e.g., Figure 2), state is passed from one basic block to the next using a memory region which is accessible to all translated code sequences, namely, a global register store 27. The global register store 27 is a repository for abstract registers, each of which corresponds to and emulates the value of a particular subject register or other subject architectural feature. During the execution of translated code 21, abstract registers are held in target registers so that

they may participate in instructions. During the execution of translator code 21, abstract register values are stored in the global register store 27 or target registers 15.

5

Thus, in basic block mode such as illustrated in Figure 2, all abstract registers must be synchronized at the end of each basic block for two reasons: (1) control returns to the translator code 19, which potentially overwrites all target registers; and (2) because code generation only sees one basic block at a time, the translator 19 must assume that all abstract registers values are live (i.e., will be used in subsequent basic blocks) and therefore must be saved. The goal of the group block optimization mechanism is to reduce synchronization across basic block boundaries that are crossed frequently, by translating multiple basic blocks as a contiguous whole. By translating multiple basic blocks together, the synchronization at block boundaries can be minimized if not eliminated.

Group block construction is triggered when the current block's profiling metric reaches a trigger threshold. This block is referred to as the trigger block. Construction can be separated into the following steps (Figure 6): (1) selecting member blocks 71; (2) ordering member blocks 73; (3) global dead code elimination 75; (4) global register allocation 77; and (5) code generation 79. The first step 71 identifies the set of blocks that are to be included in the group block by performing a depth-first search (DFS) traversal of the program's control flow graph, beginning with the trigger block and tempered by an inclusion threshold and a maximum member limit. The

second step 73 orders the set of blocks and identifies the critical path through the group block, to enable efficient code layout that minimizes synchronization code and reduces branches. The third and fourth steps 75, 77
5 perform optimizations. The final step 79 generates target code for all member blocks in turn, producing efficient code layout with efficient register allocation.

In construction of a group block and generation of
10 target code therefrom, the translator code 19 implements the steps illustrated in Figure 6. When the translator 19 encounters a basic block that was previously translated, prior to executing that block, the translator 19 checks the block's profiling metric 37 (Figure 3) against the
15 trigger threshold. The translator 19 begins group block creation when a basic block's profiling metric 37 exceeds the trigger threshold. The translator 19 identifies the members of the group block by a traversal of the control flow graph, starting with the trigger block and tempered
20 by the inclusion threshold and maximum member limit. Next, the translator 19 creates an ordering of the member blocks, which identifies the critical path through the group block. The translator 19 then performs global dead code elimination; the translator 19 gathers register
25 liveness information for each member block, using the IR corresponding to each block. Next, the translator 19 performs global register allocation according to an architecture-specific policy, which defines a partial set of uniform register mappings for all member blocks.
30 Finally, the translator 19 generates target code for each member block in order, consistent with the global register allocation constraints and using the register liveness analyses.

As noted above, the data associated with each basic block includes a profiling metric 37. In one embodiment, the profiling metric 37 is execution count, meaning that the translator 19 counts the number of times a particular basic block has been executed; in this embodiment, the profiling metric 37 is represented as an integer count field (counter). In another embodiment, the profiling metric 37 is execution time, meaning that the translator 19 keeps a running aggregate of the execution time for all executions of a particular basic block, such as by planting code in the beginning and end of a basic block to start and stop, respectively, a hardware or software timer; in this embodiment, the profiling metric 37 uses some representation of the aggregate execution time (timer). In another embodiment, the translator 19 stores multiple types of profiling metrics 37 for each basic block. In another embodiment, the translator 19 stores multiple sets of profiling metrics 37 for each basic block, corresponding to each predecessor basic block and/or each successor basic block, such that distinct profiling data is maintained for different control paths. In each translator cycle (i.e., the execution of translator code 19 between executions of translated code 21), the profiling metric 37 for the appropriate basic block is updated.

In embodiments that support group blocks, the data associated with each basic block additionally includes references 38, 39 to the basic block objects of known predecessors and successors. These references in aggregate constitute a control-flow graph of all previously executed basic blocks. During group block

formation, the translator 19 traverses this control-flow graph to determine which basic blocks to include in the group block under formation.

5 Group block formation in the illustrative embodiment is based on three thresholds: a trigger threshold, an inclusion threshold, and a maximum member limit. The trigger threshold and the inclusion threshold refer to the profiling metric 37 for each basic block. In each
10 translator cycle, the profiling metric 37 of the next basic block is compared to the trigger threshold. If the metric 37 meets the trigger threshold then group block formation begins. The inclusion threshold is then used to determine the scope of the group block, by identifying
15 which successor basic blocks to include in the group block. The maximum member limit defines the upper limit on the number of basic blocks to be included in any one group block.

20 When the trigger threshold is reached for basic block A, a new group block is formed with A as the trigger block. The translator 19 then begins the definition traversal, a traversal of A's successors in the control-flow graph to identify other member blocks to include.
25 When traversal reaches a given basic block, its profiling metric 37 is compared to the inclusion threshold. If the metric 37 meets the inclusion threshold, that basic block is marked for inclusion and the traversal continues to the block's successors. If the block's metric 37 is below the
30 inclusion threshold, that block is excluded and its successors are not traversed. When traversal ends (i.e., all paths either reach an excluded block or cycle back to an included block, or the maximum member limit is

reached), the translator 19 constructs a new group block based on all of the included basic blocks.

5 In embodiments that use isoblocks and group blocks, the control flow graph is a graph of isoblocks, meaning that different isoblocks of the same subject block are treated as different blocks for the purposes of group block creation. Thus, the profiling metrics for different isoblocks of the same subject block are not aggregated.

10

In another embodiment, isoblocks are not used in basic block translation but are used in group block translation, meaning that non-group basic block translations are generalized (not specialized on entry conditions). In 15 this embodiment, a basic block's profiling metric is disaggregated by the entry conditions of each execution, such that distinct profiling information is maintained for each theoretical isoblock (i.e., for each distinct set of entry conditions). In this embodiment, the data 20 associated with each basic block includes a profiling list, each member of which is a three-item set containing: (1) a set of entry conditions, (2) a corresponding profiling metric, and (3) a list of corresponding successor blocks. This data maintains profiling and 25 control path information for each set of entry conditions to the basic block, even though the actual basic block translation is not specialized on those entry condition. In this embodiment, the trigger threshold is compared to each profiling metric within a basic block's profiling 30 metric list. When the control flow graph is traversed, each element in a given basic block's profiling list is treated as a separate node in the control flow graph. The inclusion threshold is therefore compared against each

profiling metric in the block's profiling list. In this embodiment, group blocks are created for particular hot isoblocks (specialized to particular entry conditions) of hot subject blocks, but other isoblocks of those same
5 subject blocks are executed using the general (non-isoblock) translations of those blocks.

After the definition traversal, the translator 19 performs an ordering traversal, step 73; Figure 6, to
10 determine the order in which member blocks will be translated. The order of the member blocks affects both the instruction cache behavior of the translated code 21 (hot paths should be contiguous) and the synchronization necessary on member block boundaries (synchronization
15 should be minimized along hot paths). In one embodiment, the translator 19 performs the ordering traversal using an ordered depth-first search (DFS) algorithm, ordered by execution count. Traversal starts at the member block having the highest execution count. If a traversed member
20 block has multiple successors, the successor with the higher execution count is traversed first.

One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that group blocks are not formal basic blocks, as they may have
25 internal control branches, multiple entry points, and/or multiple exit points.

Once a group block has been formed, a further optimization may be applied to it, referred to herein as
30 "global dead code elimination." Such global dead code elimination employs the technique of liveness analysis. Global dead code elimination is the process of removing redundant work from the IR across a group of basic blocks.

Generally, subject processor state must be synchronized on translation scope boundaries. A value, such as a subject register, is said to be "live" for the range of code starting with its definition and ending with its last use prior to being re-defined (overwritten); hence, the analysis of values' (e.g., temporary values in the context of IR generation, target registers in the context of code generation, or subject registers in the context of translation) uses and definitions is known in the art as liveness analysis. Whatever knowledge (i.e., liveness analysis) the translator has regarding the uses (reads) and definitions (writes) of data and state is limited to its translation scope; the rest of the program is an unknown. More specifically, because the translator does not know which subject registers will be used outside the scope of translation (e.g., in a successor basic block), it must assume that all registers will be used. As such, the values (definitions) of any subject registers which were modified within a given basic block must be saved (stored to the global register store 27) at the end of that basic block, against the possibility of their future use. Likewise, all subject registers whose values will be used in a given basic block must be restored (loaded from the global register store 27) at the beginning of that basic block; i.e., the translated code for a basic block must restore a given subject register prior to its first use within that basic block.

The general mechanism of IR generation involves an implicit form of "local" dead code elimination, whose scope is localized to only a small group of IR nodes at once. For example, a common subexpression A in the subject code would be represented by a single IR tree for

A with multiple parent nodes, rather than multiple instances of the expression tree A itself. The "elimination" is implicit in the fact that one IR node can have links to multiple parent nodes. Likewise, the use of abstract registers as IR placeholders is an implicit form of dead code elimination. If the subject code for a given basic block never defines a particular subject register, then at the end of IR generation for that block, the abstract register corresponding to that subject register will refer to an empty IR tree. The code generation phase recognizes that, in this scenario, the appropriate abstract register need not be synchronized with the global register store. As such, local dead code elimination is implicit in the IR generation phase, occurring incrementally as IR nodes are created.

In contrast to local dead code elimination, a "global" dead code elimination algorithm is applied to a basic block's entire IR expression forest. Global dead code elimination according to the illustrative embodiment requires liveness analysis, meaning analysis of subject register uses (reads) and subject register definitions (writes) within the scope of each basic block in a group block, to identify live and dead regions. The IR is transformed to remove dead regions and thereby reduce the amount of work that must be performed by the target code. For example, at a given point in the subject code, if the translator recognizes or detects that a particular subject register will be defined (overwritten) before its next use, the subject register is said to be dead at all points in the code up to that preempting definition. In terms of the IR, subject registers which are defined but never used before being re-defined are dead code which can

be eliminated in the IR phase without ever spawning target code. In terms of target code generation, target registers which are dead can be used for other temporary or subject register values without spilling.

5

In group block global dead code elimination, liveness analysis is performed on all member blocks. Liveness analysis generates the IR forest for each member block, which is then used to derive the subject register liveness information for that block. IR forests for each member block are also needed in the code generation phase of group block creation. Once the IR for each member block is generated in liveness analysis, it can either be saved for subsequent use in code generation, or it can be
10 deleted and re-generated during code generation.
15

Group block global dead code elimination can effectively "transform" the IR in two ways. First, the IR forest generated for each member block during liveness
20 analysis can be modified, and then that entire IR forest can be propagated to (i.e., saved and reused during) the code generation phase; in this scenario, the IR transformations are propagated through the code generation phase by applying them directly to the IR forest and then
25 saving the transformed IR forest. In this scenario, the data associated with each member block includes liveness information (to be additionally used in global register allocation), and the transformed IR forest for that block. Alternatively and preferably, the step of global dead code
30 elimination which transforms the IR for a member block is performed during the final code generation phase of group block creation, using liveness information created earlier. In this embodiment, the global dead code

transformations can be recorded as list of "dead" subject registers, which is then encoded in the liveness information associated with each member block. The actual transformation of the IR forest is thus performed by the subsequent code generation phase, which uses the dead register list to prune the IR forest. This scenario allows the translator to generate the IR once during liveness analysis, then throw the IR away, and then regenerate the same IR during the code generation, at which point the IR is transformed using the liveness analysis (i.e., global dead code elimination is applied to the IR itself). In this scenario, the data associated with each member block includes liveness information, which includes a list of dead subject registers. The IR forest is not saved. Specifically, after the IR forest is (re)generated in the code generation phase, the IR trees for dead subject registers (which are listed in the dead subject register list within the liveness information) are pruned. In one embodiment, the IR created during liveness analysis is thrown away after the liveness information is extracted, to conserve memory resources. The IR forests (one per member block) are recreated during code generation, one member block at a time. In this embodiment, the IR forests for all member blocks do not coexist at any point in translation. However, the two versions of the IR forests, created during liveness analysis and code generation, respectively, are identical, as they are generated from the subject code using the same IR generation process.

30

In another embodiment, the translator creates an IR forest for each member block during liveness analysis, and then saves the IR forest, in the data associated with each

member block, to be reused during code generation. In this embodiment, the IR forests for all member blocks coexist, from the end of liveness analysis (in the global dead code elimination step) to code generation. In one
 5 alternative of this embodiment, no transformations or optimizations are performed on the IR during the period from its initial creation (during liveness analysis) and its last use (code generation).

10 In another embodiment, the IR forests for all member blocks are saved between the steps of liveness analysis and code generation, and inter-block optimizations are performed on the IR forests prior to code generation. In this embodiment, the translator takes advantage of the
 15 fact that all member block IR forests coexist at the same point in translation, and optimizations are performed across the IR forests of different member blocks which transform those IR forests. In this case, the IR forests used in code generation may not be identical to the IR
 20 forests used in liveness analysis (as in the two embodiments described above), because the IR forests have been subsequently transformed by inter-block optimizations. In other words, the IR forests used in code generation may be different than the IR forests that
 25 would result from generating them anew one member block at a time.

In group block global dead code elimination, the scope of dead code detection is increased by the fact that
 30 liveness analysis is applied to multiple blocks at the same time. Hence, if a subject register is defined in the first member block, and then redefined in the third member block (with no intervening uses or exit points), the IR

tree for the first definition can be eliminated from the first member block. By comparison, under basic block code generation, the translator 19 would be unable to detect that this subject register was dead.

5

As noted above, one goal of group block optimization is to reduce or eliminate the need for register synchronization at basic block boundaries. Accordingly, a discussion of how register allocation and synchronization is achieved by the translator 19 during group blocking is now provided.

Register allocation is the process of associating an abstract (subject) register with a target register. Register allocation is a necessary component of code generation, as abstract register values must reside in target registers to participate in target instructions. The representation of these allocations (i.e., mappings) between target registers and abstract registers is referred to as a register map. During code generation, the translator 19 maintains a working register map, which reflects the current state of register allocation (i.e., the target-to-abstract register mappings actually in existence at a given point in the target code). Reference will be had hereafter to an exit register map which is, abstractly, a snapshot of the working register map on exit from a member block. However, since the exit register map is not needed for synchronization, it is not recorded so it is purely abstract. The entry register map 40 (Figure 3) is a snapshot of the working register map on entry to a member block, which is necessary to record for synchronization purposes.

Also, as discussed above, a group block contains multiple member blocks, and code generation is performed separately for each member block. As such, each member block has its own entry register map 40 and exit register map, which reflect the allocation of particular target registers to particular subject registers at the beginning and end, respectively, of the translated code for that block.

10 Code generation for a group member block is parameterized by its entry register map 40 (the working register map on entry), but code generation also modifies the working register map. The exit register map for a member block reflects the working register map at the end
15 of that block, as modified by the code generation process. When the first member block is translated, the working register map is empty (subject to global register allocation, discussed below). At the end of translation for the first member block, the working register map
20 contains the register mappings created by the code generation process. The working register map is then copied into the entry register maps 40 of all successor member blocks.

25 At the end of code generation for a member block, some abstract registers may not require synchronization. Register maps allow the translator 19 to minimize synchronization on member block boundaries, by identifying which registers actually require synchronization. By
30 comparison, in the (non-group) basic block scenario all abstract registers must be synchronized at the end of every basic block.

At the end of a member block, three synchronization scenarios are possible based on the successor. First, if the successor is a member block which has not yet been translated, its entry register map 40 is defined to be the same as the working register map, with the consequence that no synchronization is necessary. Second, if the successor block is external to the group, then all abstract registers must be synchronized (i.e., a full synchronization) because control will return to the translator code 19 before the successor's execution. Third, if the successor block is a member block whose register map has already been fixed, then synchronization code must be inserted to reconcile the working map with the successor's entry map.

15

Some of the cost of register map synchronization is reduced by the group block ordering traversal, which minimizes register synchronization or eliminates it entirely along hot paths. Member blocks are translated in the order generated by the ordering traversal. As each member block is translated, its exit register map is propagated into the entry register map 40 of all successor member blocks whose entry register maps are not yet fixed. In effect, the hottest path in the group block is translated first, and most if not all member block boundaries along that path require no synchronization because the corresponding register maps are all consistent.

For example, the boundary between the first and second member blocks will always require no synchronization, because the second member block will always have its entry register map 40 fixed to be the same as the exit register

map 41 of the first member block. Some synchronization between member blocks may be unavoidable because group blocks can contain internal control branches and multiple entry points. This means that execution may reach the same member block from different predecessors, with different working register maps at different times. These cases require that the translator 19 synchronize the working register map with the appropriate member block's entry register map.

10

If required, register map synchronization occurs on member block boundaries. The translator 19 inserts code at the end of a member block to synchronize the working register map with the successor's entry register map 40.

15 In register map synchronization, each abstract register falls under one of ten synchronization conditions. Table 1 illustrates the ten register synchronization cases as a function of the translator's working register map and the successor's entry register map 40. Table 2 describes the register synchronization algorithm, by enumerating the ten formal synchronization cases with text descriptions of the cases and pseudo-code descriptions of the corresponding synchronization actions (the pseudo-code is explained below). Thus, at every member block boundary, every

20 abstract register is synchronized using the 10-case algorithm. This detailed articulation of synchronization conditions and actions allows the translator 19 to generate efficient synchronization code, which minimizes the synchronization cost for each abstract register.

30

The following describes the synchronization action functions listed in Table 2. "*Spill(E(a))*" saves abstract register *a* from target register *E(a)* into the subject

register bank (a component of the global register store).
 "Fill(*t*,*a*)" loads abstract register *a* from the subject
 register bank into target register *t*. "Reallocate()" moves and
 reallocates (i.e., changes the mapping of) an
 5 abstract register to a new target register if available,
 or spills the abstract register if a target register is
 not available. "FreeNoSpill(*t*)" marks a target register
 as free without spilling the associated abstract subject
 register. The FreeNoSpill() function is necessary to
 10 avoid superfluous spilling across multiple applications of
 the algorithm at the same synchronization point. Note
 that for cases with a "Nil" synchronization action, no
 synchronization code is necessary for the corresponding
 abstract registers.

15

LEGEND	
a	abstract subject register
t	target register
W	working register map {W(<i>a</i>) => <i>t</i> }
E	entry register map {E(<i>a</i>) => <i>t</i> }
dom	domain
rng	range
∈	is a member of
∉	is not a member of
W(<i>a</i>) ∉ rng E	The working register for abstract register " <i>a</i> " is not in the range of the entry register map. I.e., the target register that is currently mapped to abstract register " <i>a</i> " ("W(<i>a</i>)") is not defined in the entry register map E.

20

	$a \in \text{dom } W$			$a \notin \text{dom } W$
$a \in \text{dom } E$		$W(a) \notin \text{rng } E$	$W(a) \in \text{rng } E$	
	$E(a) \notin \text{rng } W$	6	8	4
	$E(a) \in \text{rng } W$	7	$W(a) \neq E(a)$	5
			$W(a) = E(a)$	
$a \notin \text{dom } E$		2	3	1

Table 1: Enumeration of the 10 Register Synchronization Scenarios

5

Table 2: Register Map Synchronization Scenarios			
	Case	Description	Action
1	$a \notin (\text{dom } E \cup \text{dom } W)$	$W(\dots)$ $E(\dots)$ The abstract register is neither in the working rmap or the entry rmap.	Nil
2	$a \in \text{dom } W$ \wedge $a \notin \text{dom } E$ \wedge $W(a) \notin \text{rng } E$	$W(a \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ $E(\dots)$ The abstract register is in the working rmap, but not in the entry rmap. Furthermore the target register used in the working rmap is not in the range of the entry rmap.	Spill($W(a)$)
3	$a \in \text{dom } W$ \wedge $a \notin \text{dom } E$ \wedge $W(a) \in \text{rng } E$	$W(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ $E(ax \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ The abstract register is in the working, but not in the entry rmap. However the target register used in the working rmap is in the range of the entry rmap.	Spill($W(a)$)

Table 2: Register Map Synchronization Scenarios

	Case	Description	Action
4	$a \notin \text{dom } W$ \wedge $a \in \text{dom } E$ \wedge $E(a) \notin \text{rng } W$	$W(\dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ <p>The abstract register is in the entry rmap but not in the working rmap. Furthermore the target register used in the entry rmap is not in the range of the working rmap.</p>	Fill($E(a)$, a)
5	$a \notin \text{dom } W$ \wedge $a \in \text{dom } E$ \wedge $E(a) \in \text{rng } W$	$W(ax \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ <p>The abstract register is in the entry rmap but not in the working rmap. However the target register used in the entry rmap is in the range of the working rmap.</p>	Reallocate(E (a)) Fill($E(a)$, a)
6	$a \in (\text{dom } W \cap \text{dom } E)$ \wedge $W(a) \notin \text{rng } E$ \wedge $E(a) \notin \text{rng } W$	$W(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t2, \dots)$ <p>The abstract register is in the working rmap and the entry rmap. However both use different target registers. Furthermore the target register used in the working rmap is not in the range of the entry rmap and the target register used in the entry rmap is not in the range of the working rmap.</p>	Copy $W(a) \Rightarrow$ $E(a)$ FreeNoSpill($W(a)$)
7	$a \in (\text{dom } W \cap \text{dom } E)$ \wedge $W(a) \notin \text{rng } E$ \wedge $E(a) \in \text{rng } W$	$W(a1 \Rightarrow t1, ax \Rightarrow t2, \dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t2, \dots)$ <p>The abstract register in the working rmap is in the entry rmap. However both use different target registers. The target register used in the working rmap is not in the range of the entry rmap, however the target register used in the entry rmap is in the range of the working rmap.</p>	Spill($E(a)$) Copy $W(a) \Rightarrow$ $E(a)$ FreeNoSpill($W(a)$)
8	$a \in (\text{dom } W \cap \text{dom } E)$ \wedge $W(a) \in \text{rng } E$ \wedge $E(a) \notin \text{rng } W$	$W(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t2, ax \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ <p>The abstract register in the working rmap is in the entry rmap. However both use different target registers. The target register used in the entry rmap is not in the range of the working rmap, however the target register used in the working rmap is in the range of the entry rmap.</p>	Copy $W(a) \Rightarrow$ $E(a)$ FreeNoSpill($W(a)$)

Table 2: Register Map Synchronization Scenarios			
	Case	Description	Action
9	$a \in (\text{dom } W \cap \text{dom } E)$ \wedge $W(a) \in \text{rng } E$ \wedge $E(a) \in \text{rng } W$ \wedge $W(a) \neq E(a)$	$W(a1 \Rightarrow t1, ax \Rightarrow t2, \dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t2, ay \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ The abstract register in the working rmap is in the entry rmap. Both use different target registers. However, the target register used in the entry rmap is in the range of the working rmap, and the target register used in the working rmap is in the range of the entry rmap.	$\text{Spill}(E(a))$ $\text{Copy } W(a) \Rightarrow E(a)$ $\text{FreeNoSpill}(W(a))$
10	$a \in (\text{dom } W \cap \text{dom } E)$ \wedge $W(a) \in \text{rng } E$ \wedge $E(a) \in \text{rng } W$ \wedge $W(a) = E(a)$	$W(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ $E(a1 \Rightarrow t1, \dots)$ The abstract register in the working rmap is in the entry rmap. Furthermore they both map to the same target register.	Nil

The translator 19 performs two levels of register allocation within a group block, global and local (or temporary). Global register allocation is the definition of particular register mappings, before code generation, which persist across an entire group block (i.e., throughout all member blocks). Local register allocation consists of the register mappings created in the process of code generation. Global register allocation defines particular register allocation constraints which parameterize the code generation of member blocks, by constraining local register allocation.

Abstract registers that are globally allocated do not require synchronization on member block boundaries, because they are guaranteed to be allocated to the same respective target registers in every member block. This

approach has the advantage that synchronization code (which compensates for differences in register mappings between blocks) is never required for globally allocated abstract registers on member block boundaries. The
5 disadvantage of group block register mapping is that it hinders local register allocation because the globally allocated target registers are not immediately available for new mappings. To compensate, the number of global register mappings may be limited for a particular group
10 block.

The number and selection of actual global register allocations is defined by a global register allocation policy. The global register allocation policy is
15 configurable based on subject architecture, target architecture, and applications translated. The optimal number of globally allocated registers is derived empirically, and is a function of the number of target registers, the number of subject registers, the type of
20 application being translated, and application usage patterns. The number is generally a fraction of the total number of target registers minus some small number to ensure that enough target registers remain for temporary values.

25

In cases where there are many subject registers but few target registers, such as the MIPS-X86 and PowerPC-X86 translators, the number of globally allocated registers is zero. This is because the X86 architecture has so few
30 target registers that using any fixed register allocation has been observed to produce worse target code than none at all.

In cases where there are many subject registers and many target registers, such as the X86-MIPS translator, the number of globally allocated registers (n) is three quarters the number of target registers (T). Hence:

5

$$\text{X86-MIPS:} \quad n = \frac{3}{4} * T$$

Even though the X86 architecture has few general purpose registers, it is treated as having many subject registers because many abstract registers are necessary to emulate the complex X86 processor state (including, e.g., condition code flags).

In cases where the number of subject registers and target registers is approximately the same, such as the MIPS-MIPS accelerator, most target registers are globally allocated with only a few reserved for temporary values. Hence:

$$\text{MIPS-MIPS:} \quad n = T - 3$$

In cases where the total number of subject registers in use across the entire group block (s) is less than or equal to the number of target registers (T), all subject registers are globally mapped. This means that the entire register map is constant across all member blocks. In the special case where ($s = T$), meaning that the number of target registers and active subject registers is equal, this means that there are no target registers left for temporary calculations; in this case, temporary values are locally allocated to target registers that are globally allocated to subject registers that have no further uses

within the same expression tree (such information is obtained through liveness analysis).

At the end of group block creation, code generation is performed for each member block, in the traversal order. During code generation, each member block's IR forest is (re)generated and the list of dead subject registers (contained in that block's liveness information) is used to the prune the IR forest prior to generating target code. As each member block is translated, its exit register map is propagated to the entry register maps of all successor member blocks (except those which have already been fixed). Because blocks are translated in traversal order, this has the effect of minimizing register map synchronization along hot paths, as well as making hot path translations contiguous in the target memory space. As with basic block translations, group member block translations are specialized on a set of entry conditions, namely the current working conditions when the group block was created.

Figure 7 provides an example of group block generation by the translator code 19 according to an illustrative embodiment. The example group block has five members ("A" to "E"), and initially one entry point ("Entry 1"; Entry 2 is generated later through aggregation, as discussed below) and three exit points ("Exit 1," "Exit 2," and "Exit 3"). In this example, the trigger threshold for group block creation is an execution count of 45000, and the inclusion threshold for member blocks is an execution count of 1000. The construction of this group block was triggered when block A's execution count (now 45074) reached the trigger threshold of 45000, at which point a

search of the control flow graph was performed in order to identify the group block members. In this example, five blocks were found that exceeded the inclusion threshold of 1000. Once the member blocks are identified, an ordered
5 depth first search (ordered by profiling metric) is performed such that hotter blocks and their successors are processed first; this produces a set of blocks with a critical path ordering.

10 At this stage global dead code elimination is performed. Each member block is analyzed for register uses and definitions (i.e., liveness analysis). This makes code generation more efficient in two ways. First, local register allocation can take into account which
15 subject registers are live in the group block (i.e., which subject registers will be used in the current or successor member blocks), which helps to minimize the cost of spills; dead registers are spilled first, because they do not need to be restored. In addition, if liveness
20 analysis shows that a particular subject register is defined, used, and then redefined (overwritten), the value can be thrown away any time after the last use (i.e., its target register can be freed). If liveness analysis shows that a particular subject register value is defined and
25 then redefined without any intervening uses (unlikely, as this would mean that the subject compiler generated dead code), then the corresponding IR tree for that value can be thrown away, such that no target code is ever generated for it.

30

Global register allocation is next. The translator 19 assigns frequently accessed subject registers a fixed target register mapping which is constant across all

member blocks. Globally allocated registers are non-spillable, meaning that those target registers are unavailable to local register allocation. A percentage of target registers must be kept for temporary subject
 5 register mappings when there are more subject registers than target registers. In special cases where the entire set of subject registers within the group block can fit into target registers, spills and fills are completely avoided. As illustrated in Figure 7, the translator
 10 plants code ("Pr1") to load these registers from the global register store 27 prior to entering the head of the group block ("A"); such code is referred to as prologue loads.

15 The group block is now ready for target code generation. During code generation, the translator 19 uses a working register map (the mapping between abstract registers and target registers) to keep track of register allocation. The value of the working register map at the
 20 beginning of each member block is recorded in that block's associated entry register map 40.

First the prologue block Pr1 is generated which loads the globally allocated abstract registers. At this point
 25 the working register map at the end of Pr1 is copied to the entry register map 40 of block A.

Block A is then translated, planting target code directly following the target code for Pr1. Control flow
 30 code is planted to handle the exit condition for Exit 1, which consists of a dummy branch (to be patched later) to epilogue block Ep1 (to be planted later). At the end of block A, the working register map is copied to the entry

register map 40 of block B. This fixing of B's entry register map 40 has two consequences: first, no synchronization is necessary on the path from A to B; second, entry to B from any other block (i.e., a member block of this group block or a member block of another group block using aggregation) requires synchronization of that block's exit register map with B's entry register map.

10 Block B is next on the critical path. Its target code is planted directly following block A, and code to handle the two successors, C and A, is then planted. The first successor, block C, has not yet had its entry register map 40 fixed, so the working register map is simply copied
15 into C's entry register map. The second successor, block A, however, has previously had its entry register map 40 fixed and therefore the working register map at the end of block B and the entry register map 40 of block A may differ. Any difference in the register maps requires some
20 synchronization ("B-A") along the path from block B to block A in order to bring the working register map into line with the entry register map 40. This synchronization takes the form of register spills, fills, and swaps and is detailed in the ten register map synchronization scenarios
25 above.

Block C is now translated and target code is planted directly following block C. Blocks D and E are likewise translated and planted contiguously. The path from E to A
30 again requires register map synchronization, from E's exit register map (i.e., the working register map at the end of E's translation) to A's entry register map 40, which is planted in block "E-A."

Prior to exiting the group block and returning control to the translator 19, the globally allocated registers must be synchronized to the global register store; this code is referred to as epilogue saves. After the member blocks have been translated, code generation plants epilogue blocks for all exit points (Ep1, Ep2, and Ep3), and fixes the branch targets throughout the member blocks. In embodiments that use both isoblocks and group blocks, the control flow graph traversal is made in terms of unique subject blocks (i.e., a particular basic block in the subject code) rather than isoblocks of that block. As such, isoblocks are transparent to group block creation. No special distinction is made with respect to subject blocks that have one translation or multiple translations. In the illustrative embodiment, both the group block and isoblock optimizations may be advantageously employed. However, the fact that the isoblock mechanism may create different basic block translations for the same subject code sequence complicates the process of deciding which blocks to include in the group block, since the blocks to be included may not exist until the group block is formed. The information collected using the unspecialized blocks that existed prior to the optimization must be adapted before being used in the selection and layout process.

The illustrative embodiment further employs a technique for accommodating features of nested loops in group block generation. Group blocks are originally created with only one entry point, namely the start of the trigger block. Nested loops in a program cause the inner loop to become hot first, creating a group block representing the inner loop. Later, the outer loop

becomes hot, creating a new group block that includes all the blocks of the inner loop as well as the outer loop. If the group block generation algorithm does not take account of the work done for the inner loop, but instead
5 re-does all of that work, then programs that contain deeply nested loops will progressively generate larger and larger group blocks, requiring more storage and more work on each group block generation. In addition, the older (inner) group blocks may become unreachable and therefore
10 provide little or no benefit.

According to the illustrative embodiment, group block aggregation is used to enable a previously built group block to be combined with additional optimized blocks.
15 During the phase in which blocks are selected for inclusion in a new group block, those candidates which are already included in a previous group block are identified. Rather than planting target code for these blocks, aggregation is performed, whereby the translator 19
20 creates a link to the appropriate location in the existing group block. Because these links may jump to the middle of the existing group block, the working register map corresponding to that location must be enforced; accordingly, the code planted for the link includes
25 register map synchronization code as required.

The entry register map 40 stored in the basic block data structure 30 supports group block aggregation. Aggregation allows other translated code to jump into the
30 middle of a group block, using the beginning of the member block as an entry point. Such entry points require that the current working register map be synchronized to the member block's entry register map 40, which the translator

19 implements by planting synchronization code (i.e., spills and fills) between the exit point of the predecessor and the entry point of the member block.

5 In one embodiment, some member blocks' register maps are selectively deleted to conserve resources. Initially, the entry register maps of all member blocks in a group are stored indefinitely, to facilitate entry into the group block (from an aggregate group block) at the
10 beginning of any member block. As group blocks become large, some register maps may be deleted to conserve memory. If this happens, aggregation effectively divides the group block into regions, some of which (i.e., member blocks whose register maps have been deleted) are
15 inaccessible to aggregate entry. Different policies are used to determine which register maps to store. One policy is to store all register maps of all member blocks (i.e., never delete). An alternative policy is to store register maps only for the hottest member blocks. An
20 alternative policy is to store register maps only for member blocks that are the destinations of backward branches (i.e., the start of a loop).

 In another embodiment, the data associated with each
25 group member block includes a recorded register map for every subject instruction location. This allows other translated code to jump into the middle of a group block at any point, not just the beginning of a member block, as, in some cases, a group member block may contain
30 undetected entry points when the group block is formed. This technique consumes large amounts of memory, and is therefore only appropriate when memory conservation is not a concern.

Group blocking provides a mechanism for identifying frequently executed blocks or sets of blocks and performing additional optimizations on them. Because more
 5 computationally expensive optimizations are applied to group blocks, their formation is preferably confined to basic blocks which are known to execute frequently. In the case of group blocks, the extra computation is justified by frequent execution; contiguous blocks which
 10 are executed frequently are referred to as a "hot path." Embodiments may be configured wherein multiple levels of frequency and optimization are used, such that the translator 19 detects multiple tiers of frequently
 15 executed basic blocks, and increasingly complex optimizations are applied. Alternately, and as described above only two levels of optimization are used: basic optimizations are applied to all basic blocks, and a single set of further optimizations are applied to group blocks using the group block creation mechanism described
 20 above.

Overview

Figure 8 illustrates the steps performed by the
 25 translator at run-time, between executions of translated code. When a first basic block (BB_{N-1}) finishes execution 1201, it returns control to the translator 1202. The translator increments the profiling metric of the first basic block 1203. The translator then queries the basic
 30 block cache 1205 for previously translated isoblocks of the current basic block (BB_N , which is BB_{N-1} 's successor), using the subject address returned by the first basic block's execution. If the successor block has already

been translated, the basic block cache will return one or more basic block data structures. The translator then compares the successor's profiling metric to the group block trigger threshold 1207 (this may involve aggregating
5 the profiling metrics of multiple isoblocks). If the threshold is not met, the translator then checks if any isoblocks returned by the basic block cache are compatible with the working conditions (i.e., isoblocks with entry conditions identical to the exit conditions of BB_{N-1}). If
10 a compatible isoblock is found, that translation is executed 1211.

If the successor profiling metric exceeds the group block trigger threshold, then a new group block is created
15 1213 and executed 1211, as discussed above, even if a compatible isoblock exists.

If the basic block does not return any isoblocks, or none of the isoblocks returned are compatible, then the
20 current block is translated 1217 into an isoblock specialized on the current working conditions, as discussed above. At the end of decoding BB_N , if the successor of BB_N (BB_{N+1}) is statically determinable 1219, then an extended basic is created 1215. If an extended
25 basic block is created, then BB_{N+1} is translated 1217, and so forth. When translation is complete, the new isoblock is stored in the basic block cache 1221 and then executed 1211.

30 Although a few preferred embodiments have been shown and described, it will be appreciated by those skilled in the art that various changes and modifications might be

made without departing from the scope of the invention, as defined in the appended claims.

Attention is directed to all papers and documents
5 which are filed concurrently with or previous to this specification in connection with this application and which are open to public inspection with this specification, and the contents of all such papers and documents are incorporated herein by reference.

10

All of the features disclosed in this specification (including any accompanying claims, abstract and drawings), and/or all of the steps of any method or process so disclosed, may be combined in any combination,
15 except combinations where at least some of such features and/or steps are mutually exclusive.

Each feature disclosed in this specification (including any accompanying claims, abstract and drawings)
20 may be replaced by alternative features serving the same, equivalent or similar purpose, unless expressly stated otherwise. Thus, unless expressly stated otherwise, each feature disclosed is one example only of a generic series of equivalent or similar features.

25

The invention is not restricted to the details of the foregoing embodiment(s). The invention extends to any novel one, or any novel combination, of the features disclosed in this specification (including any
30 accompanying claims, abstract and drawings), or to any novel one, or any novel combination, of the steps of any method or process so disclosed.

Claims

1. A method of translation of a plurality of basic
5 blocks of program code comprising:

decoding a first basic block;

detecting whether the subject starting address of a
10 successor block of said first basic block is statically
determinable;

if said successor basic block is statically
determinable, calculating the subject starting address of
15 said successor block; and

resuming the decoding process at the subject starting
address of said successor block.

- 20 2. The method of claim 1, wherein said first basic
block includes an unconditional jump whose subject
destination address is statically determinable and wherein
said decoding process is resumed at said subject
destination address.

25

3. The method of claim 1 or 2, wherein if said
successor block is statically determinable, an IR tree
corresponding to the dynamic calculation of the starting
subject address of said successor block is pruned.

30

4. The method of claim 1, 2 or 3, wherein if said
successor block is not statically determinable, target

code generated for said first basic block is executed prior to translation of said successor basic block.

5. The method of claim 4, further including the step
5 of synchronizing a set of abstract registers at the end of execution of said basic block and prior to decoding of said successor block.

6. The method of any preceding claim performed as
10 part of a translation process including a control loop comprising the steps of:

executing translator code which translates a first
block of subject code into translated code;

15

executing the translated code;

returning control to the translator code at the end of
execution of the translated code; and

20

executing translator code which translates a second
basic block into translated code.

7. A method of translating a plurality of basic
25 blocks of program code comprising:

applying a selection algorithm to identify a group of
previously translated basic blocks for translation as a
contiguous whole; and

30

generating an intermediate representation for each
basic block of said group.

8. The method of claim 7, wherein the step of applying a selection algorithm comprises checking a profiling metric of previously executed basic block against at least one profiling threshold.

5

9. The method of claim 8, wherein said profiling metric comprises an execution count.

10. The method of claim 8 or 9, wherein said profiling threshold comprises a selected maximum count.

10

11. The method of any of claims 7 to 10, wherein the step of applying a selection algorithm comprises the steps of:

15

beginning group block formation wherein a trigger threshold is exceeded; and

selecting additional blocks for inclusion in the group based on an inclusion threshold.

20

12. The method of claim 11, wherein group block formation is terminated when the number of blocks selected for inclusion in the group block reaches a selected limit.

25

13. The method of claim 11 or 12, wherein additional blocks of the group are selected based on data identifying known successors of a preceding block.

30 14. The method of claim 13, wherein said data comprises references to basic block objects of known predecessor and successor blocks, said references

comprising in the aggregate the control-flow graph of all previously executed basic blocks.

15. The method of any of claims 7 to 14, further
5 including the step of performing an ordering traversal of said group of basic blocks to determine the order in which the blocks of said group will be translated.

16. The method of claim 15, wherein the ordering
10 traversal is performed using an ordered depth-first search algorithm.

17. The method of claim 16, wherein said algorithm
orders the blocks based on execution count.

15

18. The method of claim 16 or 17, further comprising
the step of performing global dead code elimination on
said group block.

20 19. The method of claim 18, further comprising the
step of global register allocation.

20. The method of any of claims 7 to 19, performed as
part of a translation process including a control loop
25 comprising the steps of:

executing translator code which translates a first
block of subject code into translated code;

30 executing the translated code;

returning control to the translator code at the end of
execution of the translated code; and

executing translator code which translates a second basic block into translated code.

5 21. The method of any of claims 7 to 20, further including the steps of register allocation and register synchronization.

22. The method of claim 21, wherein the step of
10 register synchronization comprises performing a 10-case register synchronization algorithm.

23. The method of any preceding claim, wherein said steps are performed by program code stored on a tangible
15 storage medium.

24. A basic block data structure stored on a computer readable medium comprising:

20 a subject address;

a target code pointer;

a set of translation hints;

25 a set of entry conditions;

a set of exit conditions;

30 a profiling metric;

predecessor block data;

successor block data; and

an entry register map.

5 25. A method of translation of a plurality of basic blocks of program code, substantially as hereinbefore described with reference to the accompanying drawings.

26. A basic block data structure stored on a computer
10 readable medium, substantially as hereinbefore described.

ABSTRACT

BLOCK TRANSLATION OPTIMIZATIONS FOR
PROGRAM CODE CONVERSION

5

Subject program code 17 is translated to target code
21 in basic block units at run-time in a process wherein
translation of basic blocks 23 is interleaved with
10 execution of those translations. A combination of
processes designed to enhance the speed and efficiency of
run-time translation are applied based on characteristics
of particular blocks and include translating a set of
contiguous basic blocks prior to execution ("extended
15 basic blocks") and grouping and ordering of frequently
executed basic blocks for translation ("group blocking").

[Figure 1]

20







FIG. 1

202310

TRANSLATION PROCESS



CORRESPONDING IR GENERATED






FIG. 42

3202019



BASIC BLOCK DATA STRUCTURE &
BASIC BLOCK CACHE

FIG. 3




FIG. 4

EXTENDED BASIC BLOCKS

EXECUTION

TRANSLATION
(TRANSLATOR)
CODE




FIG. 5

ISO BLOCKING




FIG. 6

00000000




FIG. 7




FIG. 8